

EPED A

PD-ABQ-211

**ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION AND ECONOMIC**

**DEVELOPMENT PROJECT (EPED)**

**MASINDI DISTRICT, UGANDA**

**Report of the Project Evaluation Team**

**Submitted to :      Grants Management Unit  
                         Action Program for the Environment**

**Robert Nabanyumya  
Charlotte Bingham  
Eugene Muramira**

**September, 1997**

## LIST OF ACRONYMS

|           |  |
|-----------|--|
| ACDI/VOCA | Agricultural Cooperative Development International/Volunteers in Overseas Cooperative Assistance |
| APE       | Action Program for Environment   |
| DED       | German Development Service   |
| DEO       | District Environment Officer   |
| DTPC      | District Technical Planning Committee  |
| EIA       | Environmental Impact Assessment  |
| EPED      | Environmental Protection and Economic Development [Project]                                      |
| GOU       | Government of Uganda   |
| GMU       | Grants Management Unit   |
| IDEA      | Investment for the Development of Export Agriculture   |
| IR        | Intermediate Result  |
| KPCS      | Kisindi Primary Cooperative Society  |
| LC V      | Local Council Five   |
| M&E       | Monitoring and Evaluation  |
| MDICDP    | Masindi District Integrated Community and Development Project                                    |
| MFNP      | Murchison Falls National Park  |
| MSDP      | Masindi District Sustainable Development Plan  |
| MSGGA     | Masindi Seed and Grain Growers Association   |
| NEMA      | National Environment Management Authority  |
| PHHS      | Post Harvest handling and Storage project  |
| PRA       | Participatory Rural Appraisal  |
| RDC       | Resident District Commissioner   |
| SSDP      | Sub Country Sustainable Development Plan   |
| SO        | Strategic Objective  |
| TOR       | Terms of Reference   |
| USAID     | United States Agency for International Development   |
| UWA       | Uganda Wildlife Authority  |

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The EPED Evaluation Team wishes to acknowledge the support and assistance of the Action Program for Environment Grants Management Unit (Raymond Victurine and Jane Kisakye), ACDI/VOCA EPED Project Director Frank Turyatunga and his staff, the National Environmental Management Authority, USAID/Kampala, the Masindi District local authorities and the warm reception accorded the Team by the host/relocate villages of Alimugonza, Kitengule, Kimina A, Kimina B and Hanga.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

An Evaluation was conducted of the "Environment Protection and Economic Development Project" in August 1997. The overall goal of the 20-month project is *"To lay groundwork for long-term protection of MFNP and the Bugungu and Karuma Wildlife reserves."* This project is implemented through three components each for a particular project objective. Two of the three main objectives of the project are considered very successful and one had limited success.

The project was very successful in assisting to strengthen the capacity of Masindi District for effective planning and in the relocation of encroacher communities from the Karuma Wildlife reserve.

Concerning district environmental and natural resources management planning, the achievements at the village level were in excess of expectations with respect to plans, because the Project Director was able to leverage funds from the District and another project. Subcounty plans were not achieved because there was lack of technical capacity at the subcounty level to do so. The district's Sustainable Development Plan has been drafted. Masindi District resource planning efforts are serving as a model for the decentralization of environmental planning, impact assessment and data collection for NEMA.

With respect to relocation, the EPED Project has fully met the targets for the 20-month level of the M&E Framework and has set the stage for effective integration of the host community and the relocated population. Measures for monitoring biodiversity in the reclaimed area have been put in place and baseline data have already been collected. The relocation of 125 families has successfully vacated an estimated 500 ha of land in the Karuma Wildlife Reserve. This is a necessary, but not sufficient, element to ensure protected area integrity. The EPED Project has no provisions for ensuring monitoring and management of the vacated area by the UWA. The EPED Project currently has no resources to handle the remaining, existing encroachers (approximately 400 families) in the Karuma Reserve, not to mention Bugungu.

The limited success in empowering buffer zone communities to sustainable economic development can be attributed to the limited participation and effectiveness of the private sector association initially designated as a partner, a problem likely to be overcome now that new partners have been identified.

Prospects for sustainability are relatively good at the levels of making effective use of the planning structures and systems which are now being set up for the district, subcounty and village level planning. It is too early to tell whether economic initiatives and empowerment will be sustainable. Securing the integrity of the protected areas is a process that will take longer than the project life and further input is still required possibly by way of a second phase for this project.

*EPED Evaluation August 1997*

The Evaluation Team recommends that the project continue into a second phase with the three current components. District level planning should continue in the same direction with the addition of capabilities in a few areas and build on the success already achieved, both at the District level and in serving as a model for NEMA. The relocation/protected area component is recommended to continue, UWA should be made a committed partner to the effort.

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| LIST OF ACRONYMS . . . . .   | i        |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS . . . . .   | ii       |
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY . . . . .  | iii      |
| INTRODUCTION . . . . .   | 1        |
| 1.1. Purpose of Evaluation . . . . .   | 1        |
| 1.2. The Evaluation Team . . . . .   | 1        |
| 1.3. The Evaluation Methodology . . . . .  | 1        |
| <b>2.0. The Project and its Importance . . . . .</b>                               | <b>1</b> |
| 2.1. Brief Project Overview . . . . .  | 1        |
| 2.2. Project in the Context of USAID/Uganda . . . . .                              | 2        |
| 2.3. Relevance of the Project . . . . .  | 3        |
| 2.3.1.To causes of degradation . . . . .   | 3        |
| 2.3.2.To conservation of biodiversity . . . . .                                    | 3        |
| 2.3.3.To Economic Development . . . . .  | 4        |
| <b>3.0. The Soundness of Project Concept and Design</b>                            |          |
| . . . . .  | 4        |
| 3.1. Evaluation of Project Concept . . . . .                                       | 4        |
| 3.2. Evaluation of Project Design . . . . .  | 6        |
| 3.2.1.Logical Coherence . . . . .  | 7        |
| 3.2.2. Appropriateness of District Approach . . . . .                              | 8        |
| 3.2.3. Corrective Measures Taken to Correct Design Weaknesses . . . . .            | 9        |
| <b>4.0 Project Performance . . . . .</b>   | <b>9</b> |
| 4.1. Project Management Issues . . . . .   | 9        |
| 4.1.1. ACDI/VOCA Management . . . . .  | 9        |
| 4.1.2. Delivery and Performance of Technical Input . . . . .                       | 9        |
| 4.1.3. Management of Staff, Equipment and Other Resources . . . . .                | 10       |
| 4.2. Achievement of Project Objectives . . . . .                                   | 10       |
| 4.2.1. Strengthen Masindi District Resource Planning . . . . .                     | 10       |
| 4.2.2. Establish Basic Conditions for Long-Term Protected Area Integrity . . . . . | 12       |
| 4.2.3. Initiate Pilot Economic Activities to Increase Income of                    |          |

## Rural Men and Women in Subcounties Adjacent to Protected Area

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| .....   | 15        |
| 4.3. Institutional Framework .....                          | 17        |
| 4.3.1. NEMA and UWA .....                                   | 17        |
| 4.3.2. District Authorities .....                           | 18        |
| 4.3.3. Other Stakeholders .....                             | 18        |
| 4.4. Project Performance Monitoring and<br>Evaluation ..... | 19        |
| 4.5. Project Constraints and Response .....                 | 20        |
| <b>5.0. Project Impacts .....</b>                           | <b>20</b> |
| 5.1. District Resource Planning .....                       | 21        |
| 5.2. Protected Area Integrity .....                         | 21        |
| 5.3. Economic Initiatives/Empowerment .....                 | 22        |
| <b>6.0. Sustainability .....</b>                            | <b>22</b> |
| <b>7.0. Lessons Learned .....</b>                           | <b>22</b> |
| <b>8.0. Recommendations .....</b>                           | <b>23</b> |
| 8.1 District level Environment Planning Capacity. ....      | 23        |
| 8.2. Protected Area Integrity .....                         | 24        |
| 8.3. Pilot Economic Activities .....                        | 25        |
| <b>Appendix I : Terms of Reference .....</b>                | <b>26</b> |
| <b>Appendix II : Itinerary .....</b>                        | <b>30</b> |
| <b>Appendix III --Persons Consulted .....</b>               | <b>31</b> |
| <b>Appendix IV</b><br>.....                                 | <b>32</b> |

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1. Purpose of Evaluation

This report presents the findings of the final evaluation of the Environmental Protection and Economic Development (EPED) Project, based in Masindi District, Uganda. The evaluation, which took place from August 25 through August 30th in Kampala and Masindi, had as its purposes to:

- 1) review the project;
- 2) evaluate its impact, successes and failures with a view to distilling lessons learned that could be used to design similar projects elsewhere; and
- 3) make recommendations for the way forward on this project.

The evaluation included a review of the design and the effectiveness of the project in realizing its objectives, implementation modalities, and performance and linkages to other participating institutions. In this context, the Team has attempted to assess the sustainability of activities initiated under the project and their contribution to the long term goal: **long-term protection of Murchison Falls National Park and the Bugungu and Karuma Game Reserves (now Wildlife Reserves)**. The detailed Scope of Work of the Team is presented in Appendix 1.

### 1.2. The Evaluation Team

The team was composed of Robert Nabanyumya (Team Leader and Consultant), Charlotte Bingham (Regional Environmental Advisor, USAID/REDSO/ESA) and Eugene Muramira (Environment and Natural Resource Economist, NEMA).

### 1.3. The Evaluation Methodology

The scope of work was drafted by project staff and commented on by the Grants Management Unit (GMU). The main elements of the evaluation methodology were defined by the scope of work. The methodology included three aspects; discussions and consultation with GMU and the National Environment Management Authority (NEMA) in Kampala; field days in Masindi involving discussions with District Officials, relocated and host communities and project staff; and an extensive review of project reports and records.

## 2.0. The Project and its Importance

### 2.1. Brief Project Overview

The EPED Project was designed for financing under the USAID program by Agricultural Cooperative Development International and Volunteers in Overseas Cooperative Assistance

*EPED Evaluation August 1997*



(ACDI/VOCA). It has a budget of US \$984.831, a duration of 20 months (18 in actuality) and became operational in July/August 1996.

The overall goal of the project is to lay groundwork for the long-term protection of the Murchison Falls National Park (MFNP) and the Bugungu and Karuma Game Reserves. It was designed as a model project to test effective measures to reduce the root causes of biodiversity degradation: the illicit use of protected area resources by a subsistence population.

The project design provided for improved District Planning for natural resource management/environmental planning within Masindi District, relocation of encroacher communities in Karuma Game Reserve and economic empowerment of local communities.

ACDI/VOCA is the executing agency of the Project. The Project worked closely within the District framework. A Project Director, based at Masindi is responsible for the overall coordination and management of the project. A Senior Planner, two extension officers and four support staff assist with respect to the technical and administrative management of the project. The project concept, design and strategy are reviewed in Chapter 3 below.

## **2.2. Project in the Context of USAID/Uganda**

The 1992-1996 Country Program Strategic Plan for USAID/Uganda identified conservation of biological diversity as the focus of one of the Mission's strategic objectives -- Strategic Objective (SO)2: "Stabilize biodiversity in target areas." Since 1992, USAID's principal vehicle of assistance for this SO has been the Action Program for Environment (APE). APE has focused, in part, on improving the management of protected areas with unique or high levels of biodiversity and, in part, on protected area policy, technical capacity, infrastructure, financing, benefit sharing, and collaborative management. Recently the Mission's strategic planning for the period 1997-2001 reaffirmed conservation of biological diversity as the continued focus of USAID resources for the environment and natural resource sector through a restatement of SO2: "Critical ecosystems conserved to sustain biological diversity and to enhance benefits to society." This program is known as Conserve Biodiversity for Sustainable Development (COBS).

COBS aims to achieve three Intermediate Results (IRs):

- IR 2.1: Critical ecosystems managed to ensure biological integrity;
- IR 2.2: Pressure on critical ecosystems reduced; and
- IR 2.3: Supportive framework for conservation and sustainable development maintained.

EPED in particular contributes to IR 2.2 and IR 2.3. Among the list of illustrative activities that USAID/Uganda considers supportive of IR 2.2 are resource tenure reform (evidenced by land surveying and secure titling of relocate plots under EPED) and facilitation of resettlement in order to mitigate population pressure on the environment (evidenced by facilitating relocation of families from the Karuma Wildlife Reserve to new lands outside the protected area). Activities contributing to IR 2.3 include capacity building for decentralized natural resource management institutions (evidenced by the support to District, subcounty and village resource planning) and improvement of the knowledge base to guide natural resources management policy decisions (evidenced by the collection of village level data on resources and plans to monitor and update the data base). In addition EPED contributes to a sub-IR focused on the role of civil society in natural resources management policy formulation (evidenced by the participatory modality for development of community, subcounty and Masindi District plans). Mobilization of political leadership in support of environmental management, another sub-IR of SO2, has been advanced through the keen support and participation of District leadership in Masindi District. In all these activities, public awareness in support of conservation and sustainable development has increased, a desired result in all the activities of IR 2.3.

### **2.3. Relevance of the Project**

#### **2.3.1. To causes of degradation**

In the design of the project whose overall goal is to lay the ground work for the protection of MFNP, one would expect to find a problem statement with an analysis of the threats and pressures that are responsible for the degradation of MFNP and the institutional players. One finds such an analysis in the project proposal.

Causes of degradation are mainly related to human activities. The fact that the project tackles the human problem is, therefore, reasonable. The root causes of biodiversity degradation are poverty and population pressure. The Project is, therefore, quite relevant.

#### **2.3.2. To conservation of biodiversity**

The basic concept of the project is to stem the loss of biodiversity, through various means. It is, therefore, of interest to ask: To what extent does the project address the causes of biodiversity loss in view of other players and is voluntary relocation the best strategy for addressing the threat? It is realized that the relocated communities have moved from the already degraded areas (but designated as a reserve) and in so doing have opened up previously uncultivated and potentially prime areas! In the short term, it may be assumed that biodiversity is being lost further. The point to remember, however, is that the areas being resettled now would have been claimed and resettled anyway (haphazardly). This is evidenced by the fact that the new land parcels chosen for the relocation of encroachers are lying adjacent to and sometimes in-between private ones. Also, some of the land was

provided by local land owners from their own holdings; staying off these "high biodiversity" parcels on private land is postponing the inevitable. In the long-term, therefore, conservation of biodiversity is being ensured by the present relocation. Formerly degraded areas are expected to recover to their original selves through ecological succession.

### **2.3.3. To Economic Development**

The project concept includes a focus on economic development of communities as a principal means by which the project is to contribute to the conservation of natural resources. Masindi District, although one of the poorer districts of Uganda, has excellent climatic and soil conditions and sufficient economic resources and infrastructure to achieve the critical mass of business activity needed to drive its own economic growth and attract outside investment.

EPED's principal activity is assistance to alleviate poverty in the rural households, especially those immediately surrounding the protected area. It would be naive, and clearly unrealistic to expect people living in abject poverty to readily support the protection efforts for the MFNP, as it would be seen that these efforts run counter to the hand-to-mouth practice of their existence.

Efforts to sensitize or educate people surrounding protected areas about the benefits and importance of their environment will yield meager results until people enjoy a reasonable standard of living, founded on food security, financial self-reliance, and steadily increasing real income. Economic growth, seen in a real and persistent rise in income at the household level, is a fundamental pre-condition to initiating and sustaining cooperation and stability in the relationship between people and protected areas. The project is therefore quite important in as far as it addresses the real needs of the subsistence communities to enhance their survival.

## **3.0. The Soundness of Project Concept and Design**

The basic concept behind the EPED project is to foster conservation of biodiversity by addressing root causes of the continued biodiversity loss. The basic assumption is that poverty is a driving force in the illicit use of protected area resources.

### **3.1. Evaluation of Project Concept**

The project takes the view that strategic interventions in Masindi District, chiefly in the areas of resources management and economic development, will be crucial in the long-term protection of MFNP and the wildlife reserves.

The Evaluation team examined critically the aspect of the project concept relating to the relocation of encroacher communities. Two points of view were put in focus: i.e., Move people or move the Boundary? "Why not move the boundaries?" was the question.

*EPED Evaluation August 1997*

Discussions indicated that this is influenced by a number of factors, addressed below.

### **The main one being Land Ownership:**

The most common land tenure systems are state lease, Kibanja and landlord. State lease is where state-sponsored schemes (e.g., estates ranching) are leased land for development. Former Kibanja owners have certificates of occupancy (mainly former chiefs) issued between 1933 and 1975. Absentee landlords with "illegal" squatters on their land are common.

Land in Masindi can be accessed through:

- Inheritance;
- Purchase;
- Allocation by Government to individuals or organizations;
- Community/customary ownership (clans and communities control);
- Borrowing (by peasants) from landlords;
- Leasing from Government; or
- Squatting on land without permission.

Thus land ownership varies. Land exchange (i.e., keeping encroachers where they are and protecting instead those lands to which they might be relocated) is, therefore, almost impossible because of this variability in ownership.

Perhaps the major reason why exchange of land is not possible lies in the historical relationship between the community and the Protected Area (PA) management institutions. The PAs are regarded as exclusive to the community, are policed and there is a history of severe punishment of encroachers (not necessary settlers). To expand a PA or bring it closer to the community would be tantamount to bringing a "monster" in the midst of the community. The intentions of PA managers are in most cases regarded with suspicion and not thought honourable.

Another aspect is the location of land. Imagine a scenario where (as in this case) land from Kigumba subcounty, controlled by Kigumba LC111, <sup>1</sup> Mpumwe/Kibyama LC1s is in the PA. Available land, however, is in Pakanyi subcounty in the LC1s. Why would the people of Pakanyi give their land to the PA in order to benefit the people of Kigumba?

A significant point to consider, as well, is how the project managed to acquire land. The project accessed land through the LC1 officials with assistance from LC111 and mobilization from the district leaders. However, if the villages had said there is no land, there is nothing

---

<sup>1</sup> In Uganda LC1 to LCV refers to the local administration political structures as follows: LC1 - Village level; LC11 - Parish level; LC111 - Subcounty level; LC1V - County level and LCV - District level.

the district could have done to force them. Access to land is controlled by the community. The LCV Chairman expressed concern that proposing exchange in circumstances like these can only succeed if there is government owned land, and the latter exchanges with an encroachment.

- Reducing the extent of a PA would set a precedent at national level and is, therefore, not sustainable in the long term.
- The process of redrawing boundaries is a lengthy and complicated one and would likely run into political and bureaucratic difficulties. The project duration would even be exceeded.

Owing to the above, relocation and economic empowerment of Buffer zone communities is a sound concept, especially considering that the PA is surrounded by a subsistence population. Buffer zone management seems to need new approaches to ensure sound and secure long-term integrity of Protected Areas.

### **3.2. Evaluation of Project Design**

The project was initially planned to secure the integrity of MFNP by relocating encroachers from both Bugungu and Karuma Wildlife reserves in 20 months. During the project inception period, however, it was found that there were 530 families in Karuma Game reserve alone! A decision was made to deal with only Karuma Game reserve. This was a good decision so the project would not spread too thin on the ground and therefore offer no visible impact.

The evaluation team looked at the level of involvement of stakeholders and takes issue with the inadequate Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA) involvement and support at the PA level. Clearly, UWA needed to be intensively involved in order to ensure sustainability of initiated activities.

The time frame was grossly underestimated. Relocating 125 families in 18 months while at the same time undertaking capacity development for district planning was tremendous achievement and project management must take credit for it.

Financial resources to the disposal of the project management were too small overall or inadequately estimated for specific items, e.g., the costing for boreholes; and sometimes costings were not incorporated at all, such as, medical services and other relocatee needs; very little was set aside in real terms to deal with the relocatee communities. The capacity of the district to contribute equipment such as graders and such other resources was assumed to be larger than is practically possible.

Regarding relocatee needs, the team notes that there had been numerous discussions about this issue during project design stage. APE would not fund anything more than minimal

services to the relocated communities: the feeling then was that giving a lot would be rewarding people for breaking the law. Reference was made as to what was to be the alternative: encroachers would be thrown out with no assistance at all. The team however felt that logical resettlement still requires basic human needs such as health, and emergency food.

### 3.2.1. Logical Coherence

The project document (proposal) sets out a high level "overall goal" that is supported by three main objectives implementable through three project components. The evaluation team sought to analyze the logic of the structure, i.e., the extent to which the lower level (objectives and components and activities) would necessarily if successfully, implemented, lead to the achievement of the overall goal. The team's analysis concentrated on the overall goal, the three main objectives and the components to determine whether they were realistic and clearly stated.

The overall goal is: *"To lay the ground work for long-term protection of MFNP and the Bugungu and Karuma Wildlife reserves."*

The following remarks are pertinent:

- As argued in section 3.2, the mix of organizations in the design, in particular without strong support from UWA, is not sufficient enough for " long-term protection."
- No work was undertaken for Bugungu Wildlife reserve. It is noted that this is a pilot project to "... lay the ground work..." More work remains to be done.

The three objectives, each accompanied by the evaluation team's comments, follow.

Objective 1: *"Strengthen the capacity of Masindi District to effectively plan and manage its resources and stimulate sustained environmentally sound economic growth".*

*"...effectively plan and manage its resources..."* is an ambitious and desirable objective, but was dependent upon the district having a level of institutional strength or structure, such as a District Environment Office. This the district did not have nor develop during the life of the project. Nevertheless, the Project Director was instrumental in emphasizing the importance of the District Environment Officer post and an advertisement has gone out.

*"...stimulate sustained environmentally sound economic growth..."* is a rather nebulous concept and seems to remain so at the end of the project. The active participation of the district departments and the planning unit offers possibilities for succeeding in integrating environmental concerns into the district development plan, indeed a draft MSDP was seen off to the printer during the evaluation period. Benefit is therefore starting to be seen. It was

logical to use component one to achieve this objective.

Objective 2: This was worded in two ways in the same proposal, first on page (iii) and second on page 5:

On page (iii) - *" Establish the basic conditions for long-term protected area integrity by supporting the development of environmentally sound and economically viable land use systems in buffer zones;"* or

On page 5 - *" Assist the district to establish"...*

While the first statement implies that the project will establish the basic conditions; the second puts the task to the districts. It is unclear what the project intended to do. Either way, this high sounding objective does not in anyway imply that there will be relocation of communities from the protected areas as implemented by component two. The evaluation team specifically notes and appreciates the success achieved in implementing component two of this EPED project.

Objective 3: Objective 3 is also stated at variance on page (iii) and page 5 of the same document.

On page (iii) - *"engender a sustained rise in real income of rural men and women; commencing in subcounties adjacent to the protected area;"* or

On page 5 - *"initiate pilot economic activities to increase income of rural men and women in subcounties adjacent to the protected areas."*

The page 5 version seems more realistic for the resources and life time of the project and the team hopes that this was the objective meant by the parties who designed this important project. Indeed, the component 3 used to attempt achieving objective three seems to be directed to the page 5 version.

A description of specific project components is contained in Section 4.0.

### **3.2.2. Appropriateness of District Approach**

The District approach was adopted on the realization that natural resource management was also to follow the decentralization path. Here, the districts are expected to play a leading role in natural resources/environmental management.

A PA approach would have been difficult especially in acquiring land from local communities to resettle encroachers. Until this perception changes, local people will still regard any land passed on to/through PA institutions for whatever purposes as having been

ceded to the "Park". If the modality had been compensation, it is possible PAs would have been the appropriate institution.

There was already consultation between the district authorities and the PA management (including GTZ). The PA management was seeking to evict the encroachers: the district was concerned that there were reports of mistreatment (extortion, rape and manhandling, etc) of the people by PA authorities. The PA authorities maintained, at that time, their recourse to the established laws and were asking the district to find a way of accommodating people. Although the district authorities believed they could find land, they needed assistance to implement such a program, since they had no financial and technical resources.

Only the resettlement component (component 2) would have had relevance with the PA institution, District wide activities in component 1, and specific activities in component 3 may not have been suitable for implementation by PA institutions. The District approach was therefore quite appropriate.

### **3.2.3. Corrective Measures Taken to Correct Design Weaknesses**

The flexibility and adaptability of the Project Director in response to unplanned situations has been admirable. Secondly, the use of leveraging resources with other projects, such as the Masindi District Integrated Community and Development Project (MDICDP), was a very good measure. Looked at differently, achievement of the project objectives could easily have been at a lower scale with a less apt project Director. We all thought the Project Director did a fantastic job with the time and resources available and that without someone who knew districts, Uganda and the institutions as well as he did, there would have been little success, much less the considerable success that was achieved in such a short period of time.

## **4.0 Project Performance**

Project performance is here examined by consideration of the delivery and performance of technical input as well as the management of staff, equipment and other resources. The most important aspect, the achievement of project objectives, is then thoroughly examined.

### **4.1. Project Management Issues**

#### **4.1.1. ACDI/VOCA Management**

There was broad, general satisfaction with ACDI/VOCA backstopping of the project. While project staff and consultants are covered in section 4.1.3, a general comment here is that the Project Director worked quite well, he is a problem solver and manages his staff well.

#### **4.1.2. Delivery and Performance of Technical Input**



By far the most critical Technical Assistance position on this project has been that of the Project Director (PD). The PD has been one of the greatest strengths of the project and has been critical to its level of success. His dedication to the project and its objectives has been obvious. His unique background, strong familiarity with environment issues and pre-existing network of personal contacts in the country have all been great assets.

#### **4.1.3. Management of Staff, Equipment and Other Resources**

No problems detected. The adaptability of management to unplanned situations enhanced project performance. There is proper division of roles and all personnel are well managed. Staff were adequate and were all performing their roles satisfactorily. Equipment was being well managed, all properly logged. Financial resources have been audited.

### **4.2 Achievement of Project Objectives**

The EPED Project engaged a consultant for six weeks to set up the project Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Framework. The Team examined this framework with a view to using the monitoring indicators for the 20-month Intermediate Results targets. The considered view of the Team is that most of the targets were unrealistic in terms of the available project life and resources. The M&E Framework also did not take into account the particular situation of Masindi, which requires patient, participatory work with District, subcounty and local officials and stakeholders.

The ambitious framework for M&E mirrored the overly ambitious project design. Further, both the design and the M&E framework assumed an ideal set of conditions. For example, it is unrealistic to assume the presence of trained capacity within the local authorities and that staff have resources budgeted and at their disposal. Other impediments included the constraints of difficult transport in unpredictable weather conditions, the seasonal labor requirements for planting and harvesting, intermittent availability of electricity with respect to office tasks, and other field conditions that seemingly were not taken into account. In view of the above, the Team could not take most of the M&E targets as suitable measures of success of the project. The Team, thus, chose to focus on the actual achievements of the project.

One of the major drives for success of EPED to date has been synergy through collaboration with other partners. These partners include the District itself, DED (German Development Service), the UWA, the USAID IDEA project, PL 480 Title II Monetization in Uganda and the Post Harvest Handling and Storage Project (PHHS).

#### **4.2.1. Strengthen Masindi District Resource Planning**

*Objective 1: Strengthen the capacity of Masindi District to effectively plan and manage its resources and stimulate sustained environmentally sound economic growth.*

The modality of achievement of Objective 1 is through implementation of Component 1 of the Project, namely: strengthening district planning for environmental protection and economic development.

The EPED M&E Framework reckons that at the 20-month IR level target, the Project will have carried out:

- resource inventories, strategic plans and annual resource plans for 104 villages;
- resource inventories, strategic plans and annual resource plans for all 14 sub-counties;
- resource inventories, strategic plans and annual resource plans for Masindi District.

The indicators/measures and measurement methodology for Component 1 were considered generally inappropriate at the 20-month level, since plan approval and plan implementation have not yet occurred.

Under this component, the Project has achieved:

- 530 village Participatory Rural Appraisals (PRA), which include natural resource inventories, and 530 Community Action Plans, covering all villages in the District;
- three draft Subcounty Sustainable Development Plans (SSDPs), including resource inventories;
- a Draft Masindi Sustainable Development Plan.

In order to achieve the output indicated above successfully, several activities were undertaken, some of which were not anticipated in the project design, to overcome a number of obstacles. These activities included:

- PRA design, selection of local consultations, identification of PRA participants and district participants (jointly with MDICDP), training of trainers workshop for 25 subcounty level PRA coordinators and 7 District Planners, followed by training of 76 village PRA team members in methods of community/village data collection;
- collection of data from all villages in the district, using PRA techniques;

- establishment of close links with MDICDP, including the EPED Senior Planner's membership on the MDICDP Steering Committee;
- agreements regarding MDICDP financing of PRA activities;
- team building workshops for all fourteen subcounties carried out by the EPED Senior Planner and District Planner;
- design of the MSDP framework, which was discussed with all Heads of Departments and followed-up with drafts;
- coordination on subagreement with NEMA regarding NEMA's completion of the Masindi District Profile;
- encouragement of District to recruit District Environmental Officer(DEO), since the Project Director had become the de facto DEO; and
- international consultant's report for hydroelectric, irrigation and gravity water supply on River Waki for future use in the MSDP and because the District is especially interested in determining the possibilities for large-scale investment;
- development of data collection forms (at the village, subcounty and District level) for development of a subcounty-based information system to support development planning and environmental monitoring, in collaboration with NEMA, which will serve as a model; and
- testing of data collection forms and a workshop.

The achievements at the village level were in excess of expectations with respect to plans, because the Project Director was able to leverage funds of \$10,000 from the MDICDP and \$15,000 from the District, based on the percentage retention from subcounty revenue retention scheme. Subcounty plans were not achieved because there was lack of technical capacity at the subcounty level to do so. The Masindi Sustainable Development Plan has been drafted.

#### **4.2.2. Establish Basic Conditions for Long-Term Protected Area Integrity**

*Objective 2: Assist the District to establish the basic conditions for long-term protected area integrity by implementing environmentally sound and economically sustainable land use systems in buffer zones.*

The modality of achievement of Objective 2 is through implementation of Component 2 of the Project, namely: sustainable land use -- voluntary relocation (stated in the original project

proposal and the M&E Framework as voluntary resettlement for protected area integrity).

The EPED M&E Framework reckons that at the 20-month IR level target, the Project will have carried out:

- Voluntary relocation procedures derived and tested.

The recommended indicators/measures for this IR at 20 months were:

- Relocation procedures agreed upon by the District, Game Reserves and homesteaders;
- Number of homesteaders voluntarily resettled;
- Number of cultivated protected hectares reclaimed.

Under this component, the Project has achieved:

- A Relocation (originally entitled Resettlement) Plan prepared in a participatory manner with a Resettlement Committee and agreed upon by the stakeholders;
- 125 families to have been relocated by mid September 1997, the majority of which are already relocated on approximately 8-hectare parcels in four relocation villages;
- progressive integration of the relocatees within the host communities, as evidenced by joint cooperative efforts and amicable relationships;
- movement of population from approximately 500 hectares within Karuma Wildlife Reserve.

In order to meet the targets above successfully, many issues needed to be resolved and constraints overcome, including modifications of the original project design. Activities included:

- sensitization by district leadership to the subcounty level undertaken for Pakanyi, Kigumba, Kiryandongo and Mutunda subcounties;
- preparation of Community Profile for the relocating population of Mpumwe-Kibyama, Kitengule-Nyakarongo community and the Alimugonza-Kiruli community;
- assembling of relocation team, including formation of Resettlement

Committee:

- baseline Socio-economic Survey by sampling of 30 staying encroachers, 30 host community families and 100 relocating families, including the male, female head, and youth in every second family (alternating male and female respondents);
- design of Relocation Plan, based upon the findings of the Socio-economic Survey;
- identification of new lands available in four host communities in concert with local, subcounty and District officials,
- securing and demarcation of 125 parcels of 8 ha each in four host villages, namely: Alimugonza, Kitengule, Kimina A, Kimina B (to be renamed as a new LC I called Tantala village), and Hanga;
- land surveys, which necessitated special protection of surveyors by game guards because of fear of wild animals;
- through a participatory process between the District Resettlement Committee and the communities in the Wildlife Reserve, 125 families out of 480 applicant families selected for relocation;
- Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), incorporating mitigative measures undertaken;
- identification of water sources, protection of 10 springs and establishment of 7 boreholes, in four relocation areas, entailing engagement of a hydrological consultant and close cooperation with the Directorate of Water Development (since the cost of boreholes had been underestimated in the project design);
- opening up of 50 km of tracks and the laying of culverts in swampy areas and at stream crossings to provide access into the host/relocation villages, instead of improvement of 16 km of a local administration road, because the latter would not have provided access to the host/relocate villages and the local administration was unable to provide the anticipated equipment;
- provision of "murrum" to the District to spot repair the 16 kms of local administration road;
- gradual relocation (using lorries) of 125 families, some of whose relocation needed to be delayed because of late rains, which, in turn, delayed the harvest

date in the reserve:

- construction of relocation Reception Centres and demarcation of 4 ha of community land, half for commercial services and half for social infrastructure;
- provision of emergency health services, including medicines and a nurse to deal with sickness, arising out of the project's inadequate design, which did not provide for shelter and emergency food;
- emergency provision of plastic sheeting, since thatch for roofing was unavailable at the time many families needed to move;
- development of plans for a model farm and associated land use plan by a local consultant agricultural economist;
- continued mobilization and sensitization of host and relocating communities with particular attention to development of income-generating activities at the household level, personal hygiene and education;
- registration of parcels and securing of land titles (September-December 1997) for relocate lands;
- update of the voter register to include relocated persons in their new locations; and
- continued follow-up with host/relocation villages and village committees to ensure proper integration and secure livelihoods.

The EPED Project has fully met the targets for the 20-month level of the M&E Framework and has set the stage for effective integration of the host community and the relocated population. Measures for monitoring biodiversity in the reclaimed area have been put in place and baseline data have already been collected (see *Biodiversity of Karuma Wildlife Reserve*, May/June 1997).

The 20-month expected project intermediate results did not address protected area integrity, except with respect to measuring the area of reclaimed PA lands. This issue, of central importance to a key project objective, is discussed in Section 5.2.

#### **4.2.3. Initiate Pilot Economic Activities to Increase Income of Rural Men and Women in Subcounties Adjacent to Protected Area**

The Team notes that this objective has been variously stated in the initial project proposal,

*EPED Evaluation August 1997*

various progress reports and the M&E Framework.

*Objective 3: Engender a sustained rise in real income of rural men and women OR Initiate pilot economic activities to increase income of rural men and women in subcounties adjacent to the protected area.*

The Team decided that the latter objective focusing on initiation of pilot economic activities was the more appropriate one to evaluate. The modality of achievement of Objective 3 is through implementation of Component 3 of the Project, namely: Economic Development.

The EPED M&E Framework reckons that at the 20-month IR level target, the Project will have:

- tested procedures for economic empowerment of buffer zone farmers.

The recommended indicators/measures for this IR at 20 months were:

- % increase in earnings projected from improved post-harvest processes identified;
- % increase in earnings projected from improved marketing channels identified; and
- No. of procedures identified specifically for empowering women.

The above indicators are different from those envisaged in the first M&E Framework and were revised because the first ones had been identified as being unrealistic.

No data are available to the project on buffer zone farmer earnings from improved post-harvest processes or improved marketing channels, although progress has been made in demonstrating post-harvest technologies and in working with marketing channels. The socio-economic survey should be repeated in April 1998 in order to obtain information that will allow the assessment of changes in earnings. The foundation, we must note, for economic success of the relocated population, has been laid through provision of 8 ha of secure land to each household.

With respect to procedures identified specifically for women's empowerment, the PRAs undertaken in all villages of the District were conducted by women facilitators with women in order to identify women's priorities for targeted interventions.

The project had originally emphasized working with the Masindi Seed and Grain Growers Association (MSGGA). According to a consultant's report (Olney, 1997) on Crop Marketing and Microenterprise Development:

*EPED Evaluation August 1997*

*Involvement in MSGGA has not gone well and EPED's role was usurped by another donor.... Before EPED began seriously to implement its commitments to MSGGA, the story took a strange twist. when another US-funded donor, the African Development Foundation staged a takeover of EPED's projected role...MSGGA had clearly hoped to duplicate its funding and has been less than candid in its dealings with the project on the subject. As a result, EPED has withdrawn support for all except a residual amount in packing materials, the provision of technical assistance to produce a business plan and the payment of the salaries of a business manager and accounts assistant (Olney, 1997).*

Subsequently, EPED identified the Kisindi Primary Cooperative Society (KPCS) as an alternative partner. KPCS operates over a fairly large area and support to it would set a stage for buffer zone community economic empowerment, as KPCS is nearer to the relocated/host villages.

Activities undertaken by EPED for this component include:

- Subcounty level workshops to instruct local-level artisans in the construction of grain dryers and silos, jointly undertaken with the USAID-funded Post Harvest Handling and Storage Project (PHHS);
- Agricultural extension activities, especially in harvesting and storage carried out jointly with the District Agricultural Office;
- Mobilization of women into groups to encourage community self-help, including assessment of possibility to use the Adult Literacy Program to introduce environmental education, health and sanitation and enterprise development;
- KPCS model maize dryers and silos put in place; and
- Workshop with the Department of Energy in the Ministry of Natural Resources on improved energy technologies.

Pilot economic activities have been initiated and the project hopes to pursue further work with KPCS and USAID's PRESTO Microenterprise Project. The project has restricted its work with a weak partner (MSGGA). This change in direction from the original project proposal is to be applauded.

#### **4.3. Institutional Framework**

##### **4.3.1. NEMA and UWA**

*EPED Evaluation August 1997*



The project has attempted to work with both NEMA and UWA as far as is practicable within the project design limits.

The EPED Project activities were well linked with NEMA priorities and collaboration was quite good. NEMA's input was timely and fine, as it provided the District profile, on time. Discussions with NEMA indicate the institution is interested in the project activities and hopes to have Masindi District as a model district for environment management in the country. NEMA's District Support Coordinator particularly praised the project for its achievements and its utility and applicability as a model for District, subcounty and village planning and data collection.

UWA did not seem to be fully involved in project activities, although the MFNP warden hoped to have a month working intensively with the project specifically on field activities, such as meetings with relocatees. The general uncertainty in job security for the UWA establishment has demoralized the staff in the field. Administrative changes and ambiguities have also hindered collaboration.

The bigger problem with UWA is that if the project ended now, UWA has no resources to follow-up on what is being done. The staff have not been paid for almost six months, and commitment to carry out activities is very low. It was also noted that the Karuma reserve boundary is not directly under the MFNP and there is not much monitoring carried out on encroachment, by the MFNP authorities. The National Park and Game reserve authorities should collaborate more effectively. USAID is encouraged to support this.

#### **4.3.2. District Authorities**

District authorities, particularly the RDC and Chairman LCV feel the project was timely. There is overwhelming support for project activities at district level. The RDC, LCV and CAO were all involved in locating, securing and demarcation of land for the relocatees.

There is anxiety and a persistent request on the part of the district authorities to have project activities continue. Indeed as the RDC stated ".... if the project stopped now, all our efforts would have been put to waste...."

#### **4.3.3. Other Stakeholders**

The performance of this project, like many other projects depended on the performance and the active involvement of other stakeholders such as KPCS, MSGGA, the district authorities and local communities. The response from these various stakeholders was positive and assisted in the achievement of project objectives. Others stakeholders to natural resources management in Masindi include the Representatives of Lands and Agriculture and the physical planner. These should be involved in any next phase. The team notes that Agriculture Department, is already involved now through the District Agriculture Officer.

With the exception of MSGGA, the cumulative support from project stakeholders enhanced achievements.

#### **4.4. Project Performance Monitoring and Evaluation**

The Evaluation scope of work specifically requested the evaluation team to analyze the effectiveness of the monitoring program at assessing project performance and progress. The team noted that the monitoring and evaluation framework developed for the project was overly ambitious and therefore not quite effective. This was probably because the original project design was ambitious correspondingly influencing the framework for assessing project progress. In actual fact, the team felt that in most cases the project could not be evaluated in accordance with the M&E framework developed for it.

An effective project monitoring program should be developed with full involvement of project management staff in order that continuous assessments are carried out. It seemed to the team that the M&E framework was developed immediately at the start of the project well before project staff were able to internalize project issues and set themselves benchmarks for continuous assessments. In most cases the targets set to be achieved within the 20 month period were way beyond realistic terms.

For Objective 3, for example, the M&E sets the IR indicator as "*% age increase in earnings projected from improved post-harvest processes identified*". This is highly ambiguous and ambitious, not attainable during the project life, and could be termed theoretical.

In selecting indicators to monitor project progress, it is advisable that as a general rule the first list of indicators be actually drawn up by primary stakeholders and fieldworkers. The Project Manager/Supervisors should then examine whether the information proposed contains his/their information needs, and if it does not, to propose, justify and negotiate the inclusion of additional indicators.

In hindsight, participatory identification (and use) of indicators should have been conducted as an integral component of project development, and, of course, depends upon the successful identification of key stakeholders (not the case with MSGGA), and the creation of opportunities for them to share control over the decision making process. It is beyond the scope of this report to go into detail regarding the participatory tools and techniques which can be employed for this purpose, but there are many texts and manuals on this subject already widely available.

It is hoped, however, that future M&E frameworks will be developed in a participatory manner with the full involvement of Project Management Staff and relevant stakeholders, so that the indicators are realistic. More fundamental, however, is a project design that includes both necessary and sufficient components to achieving the results the M&E framework is designed to examine.

#### **4.5. Project Constraints and Response**

One initial project constraint detected has been TIME; and another is FINANCIAL resources. The period of 20 months to achieve the three main project objectives was an over ambition. The response, however, has been an attempt by project management, rightly so, to undertake collaborative problem solving with other programmes such as the leveraging of funds and joint PRA training exercises, with the MDICDP. This innovative approach on part of project staff should be applauded.

Initially, the project was planned for Karuma and Bugungu wildlife reserves. But at project inception, it was realized that 530 families existed in Karuma alone! The response was to deal with only Karuma wildlife reserve, in order that the project should not spread so thin on the ground.

There has been an inherent constraint within the project design itself. Very little planning and resources were set aside to deal with the communities. These issues include timing, e.g., time for relocated households to harvest crops before moving, provision of medical care and social services, transportation facilities, etc. Innovation and flexibility within project management has been an asset. Relocated people need schools, community centres and markets. The project is trying to network with the district authorities and other donor inputs to assist. Already DED is to provide a school to Alimugonza.

There are no institutional structures through which the project could channel environmental management activities or resources. The Project Director was the de facto District Environment Officer.

Overall, this project seems a model of overcoming constraints and impediments by finding innovative solutions, leveraging finances and working with partners.

#### **5.0. Project Impacts**

The project has succeeded in initiating a culture of district level planning starting at subcounty levels. District planning capacity has considerably been enhanced and natural resource management aspects are being addressed in the Masindi District Sustainable Development Plan. The impact will be felt over the next few years as the Masindi District Sustainable Development Plan is implemented.

The approximately 500 ha of land vacated by the encroachers in the Karuma Wildlife reserve is now free for conservation. There is no direct measurable impact of the project, at present, as to the loss or gain in biodiversity as a result of the relocations. The immediate impact is probably small, if any. A baseline has however been set from the inventories carried out by the Makerere University Institute of Environment and Natural Resources. Because the work was initiated so as to involve degree students to continue to follow-up with the surveys, the

potential for measuring this in the future is in place.

It is too soon to determine improvement in living standards of communities, but secure land title is a good foundation for sustainable improvement. More effort is still required. Local empowerment of communities over their resources is significant in relation to secure land holdings they now have.

### **5.1. District Resource Planning**

Awareness of the need for district planning and for participation of communities in this planning has been enhanced. District leadership has become articulate on environment and planning issues and those consulted expressed support for more planning initiatives. Evidence of the institutionalization of participatory planning is the fact that the District has included funding for annual PRA activities in its annual budget as a line item. The EPED Project has assisted the District in realizing its hopes for the long-term development of the Waki River's resource potential, by provision of an international consultancy input to evaluate the river's hydro power potential. The consultancy report is to be used for further planning.

As a result of the activities undertaken, community/village knowledge is being incorporated into subcounty plans and the District plan. Village priorities will feed into subcounty and District planning priorities.

Masindi District resource planning efforts are serving as a model for the decentralization of environmental planning, impact assessment and data collection for NEMA. The EPED Project has developed forms for village, subcounty and District level data collection, for example. A draft Masindi District Sustainable Development Plan exists. These results have been achieved for Masindi District with funding levels and timetables considerably less than for other districts.

### **5.2. Protected Area Integrity**

The relocation of 125 families has successfully vacated an estimated 500 ha of land in the Karuma Wildlife Reserve. This is a necessary, but not sufficient, element to ensure protected area integrity. The EPED Project has no provisions for ensuring monitoring and management of the vacated area by the UWA. Prevention of re-encroachment and fresh encroachments is the responsibility of UWA and not of EPED. The EPED Project currently has no resources to handle the remaining, existing encroachers (approximately 400 families) in the Karuma Reserve, not to mention Bugungu. The capacity of UWA to undertake follow-up is doubtful (see Section 4.3.1). Clearly, total and sustainable achievement of objective 2 would have needed provision of a second component under this objective; namely "support to UWA activities" to enable monitoring so that no re-encroachment or fresh encroachments are

undertaken. There is not even any routine maintenance of the reserve boundary.

### **5.3. Economic Initiatives/Empowerment**

It is simply too early to tell if economic initiatives and empowerment have been successful. A foundation has been laid, including secure land tenure, better marketing opportunities as a result of better access, and improved availability of information concerning appropriate technology for maize drying and storage.

### **6.0. Sustainability**

Planning structures are in place and systems are being set up for district, subcounty and village level planning, starting with the strengthening of the District Planning Unit and the collection and analysis of village level data and priorities. While an incipient culture for planning now exists, much remains to be done to make this sustainable. For example, natural resource inventories, land suitability analyses, systems for updatable data bases and capacity for environmental impact assessment are needed. If the District is to continue to lead the way as a model for NEMA in environmental planning, then efforts to support planning must continue.

The sustainability of securing the integrity of the PA is in doubt. First, the decision to relocate only about a quarter of the encroacher families and not all in Karuma Reserve, without assurances that UWA would relocate the others, results in only partial protection. It was, however, a good decision to focus on only one protected area. Second, relocation with provision of substitute land has set a precedent; thus, trying to remove the remaining encroachers, even in a humane way, would lead people to expect and demand similar treatment. Clearly, achievement of the long-term objective of protected area integrity would require support to UWA to follow the model provided by EPED.

It does appear that the relocated families have the basis to achieve sustainable livelihoods on their new lands, where each family has approximately 8 ha available for use as well as secure title, improved access to water, better water quality and improved roads or tracks. These improvements also benefit the host populations.

### **7.0. Lessons Learned**

District planning in Uganda requires development of awareness, sensitization, capacity building, recruitment of personnel, data collection by PRA techniques and many other activities preparatory to achieving a district level planning apparatus. Full realization of district level planning, subcounty planning and village planning cannot be fully nor sustainably achieved in the 18 months available to the project in the field. Even if EPED resources for district resource planning had been considerably more generous, the capacity of the participating partners, including the district, to absorb these resources in a such a short

time would have been in doubt. Thus, it is equally not realistic to expect long-term sustainability of these activities, based on EPED activities to date.

With respect to relocation, it is possible to relocate people out of protected areas in a humane manner, as opposed to past experience in Uganda, despite limited resources. The relocation under the EPED Project offers a model for similar situations where available, unclaimed lands exist in the vicinity. Nevertheless, the same model could be modified in other areas where land is not available, in which case such land would need to be purchased. Relocation experiences elsewhere have shown that considerable attention needs to be paid to the timing, logistics, emergency support and other forms of social, economic and psychological assistance. Although the EPED Project budget did not provide for these, the Project Director assured that these needs were met to the extent feasible. Thus, this relocation experience repeats lessons learned elsewhere.

As an overall conclusion the project has been successful in achieving both objective one and two but less successful for objective three. This is mainly because of performance of other stakeholders (mainly MSGGA) other than a failure on part of project management.

## **8.0. Recommendations**

### **8.1. District Level Environmental Planning Capacity**

It is only logical to expect a continuous effort towards consolidation of activities for strengthening District Planning. Planning procedures as initiated from the village level, with the use of PRA, has been exemplary and no modifications are envisaged. Additional needs include resource inventories, land suitability analysis, and EIAs, based on appropriate thresholds. Quoting direct from the RDC, *"If the project stops now we could lose all that has been put in."* It will be useful to have further elaboration of village, subcounty and district level priorities to make Community Action Plans (CAPs) and also form a basis for Central Government funding or funding from other sources. It will further be useful to support implementation of some of the plans that have already been developed to ensure confidence within the relevant communities.

Data collection forms should be thoroughly tested, updated as necessary, to act as a model for NEMA for the benefit of other districts. It seems quite useful to develop the subcounty planning capacity first to further support the district level.

Recommendation: The Team believes that the district level environmental planning capacity component of the project was well-conceived, is serving as a model for NEMA and should be continued as conceived with the addition of components related to natural resource inventories, land suitability analysis and EIA capacity and others noted above. An important assumption to this recommendation is that the advertised position for a District level environmental planner will be filled. Discussions with the current Project Director

concerning future directions for this component indicated that EPED has appropriate and reasonable propositions for continuing this component. In short, the Team recommends that EPED build on the success and synergy already achieved in the District and with District government stakeholders and others.

## **8.2. Protected Area Integrity**

There are two aspects related to protected area integrity in the Masindi case: 1) relocation of the remaining encroachers out of the Karuma Wildlife Reserve; and 2) monitoring and enforcement of no re-encroachment in the vacated lands of the Reserve and no new encroachment in new areas of the Reserve.

The relocation of encroachers from the Karuma Wildlife Reserve is not a finished job. Funds should be sought to complete this initiated activity as soon as practicable. Relocation of 125 families to areas with secure title is an important step for those households as such and is a contribution to sustainable economic development, but is not an effective solution to protected area integrity of the Reserve. Karuma Wildlife Reserve is a good buffer, critical to the long-term protection of MFNP and support to its integrity is therefore very important. Either EPED or some other donor should complete the already started job; preferably EPED, as it would then be easier to continue with what has been initiated than getting in new players. The relocation process could continue in the same way as all the players are now agreed to the procedure. Although there have been points of view to the fact that giving the relocatees a lot of facilities such as clinics and schools would be rewarding people for breaking the law, the team still recommends that funds should be made available for the provision of basic community relevant services (schools, support to housing, health etc) in any next phase. Efforts towards a second phase or follow up activities should be immediately initiated, while there is still strong project support from the District authorities and other stakeholders. In any next phase it will be necessary to build in some funds for purchase of land holdings as it now seems there is not enough land to give away in the district.

The Team did not visit the Bugungu Wildlife Reserve and thus cannot offer comment as to whether a future effort should concentrate on consolidating the gains made in Karuma or attempt to deal with both reserves. This question should be addressed within the context of a second phase proposal.

**Recommendation:** In the particular case, EPED as a pilot project has laid the groundwork (showing that humane relocation could be achieved and by supporting development of viable development outside the boundaries of the PA), but no transfer of skills, information or the like has been made to UWA or any other body that might be a likely candidate to handle future encroachment in Masindi District or elsewhere. The Team recommends that UWA be actively engaged in any second phase of the project in order that UWA can develop a similar level of expertise to that already developed by EPED. To do so will likely require funding

support to UWA, their active interest, and potentially the development of a particular unit or group of individuals whose job it becomes. While wardens and local UWA staff would need to be involved, relocation is a specialized activity that requires specialized training and experience. Support to UWA to develop relocation expertise could be considered as part of the EPED project or as a separate but collaborating activity.

The second aspect of the situation is the need for monitoring and follow-up by UWA to ensure that lands freed of encroachers remain that way (both now and for future vacated lands) and that land currently not subject to encroachment is not settled and cultivated. Without monitoring to ensure continued protection, the efforts achieved to date and any future efforts are indeed fruitless.

Recommendation: Agreements need to be made with UWA that regular monitoring of the Karuma Wildlife Reserve is performed and that procedures are in place to prevent new encroachment and re-encroachment. Effectively doing so means that UWA needs to be an active partner in the project. While a second phase of EPED could provide training and sensitization for the monitors, this capacity needs to be institutionalized with UWA itself. A necessary condition is that UWA staff to do this are in place, are being paid, know how to monitor and consider this to be their job. Consultations with UWA and with other donors supporting UWA will be needed in order to determine whether and what kind of support needs to be provided directly to UWA or indirectly through a project such as EPED to accomplish this. If UWA cannot provide the appropriately strong level of commitment needed, the Team would recommend that the EPED project drop the protected area integrity component of the project entirely.

### **8.3. Pilot Economic Activities**

This component of the project needs a further re-examination as to how best it should be implemented, but for a start, the identified KPCS partner should be utilized.

Recommendation: The Team was impressed with the future directions outlined in the Olney report to EPED (see Appendix iv: Documents consulted); and endorses the concepts contained therein.

As a final note, the Evaluation Team recommends that the M&E framework should, in the future, be developed in consultation with project staff and relevant stakeholders to enable its continuous use.



## **Appendix I : Terms of Reference**

### **USAID ACTION PROGRAM FOR THE ENVIRONMENT (APE) ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (EPED) PROJECT, MASINDI**

#### **Grant Evaluation Scope of Work**

##### **General Information**

###### **Project Title**

A pilot project for Environmental Protection and Economic Development.

###### **Project Goal, Purpose and Objectives**

EPED project was a 20 month pilot effort with building Masindi District's capacity to manage, monitor and protect its natural resources.

The goal of the project was to lay the groundwork for long-term protection of Murchison Falls National Park (MFNP) and the Bugungu and Karuma Game Reserves (now Wildlife Reserves).

The project's purpose was to develop and test effective measures for the reduction of the root cause of bio-diversity degradation: the illicit use of protected resources by a subsistence population. This was to be achieved through pilot activities to raise income in buffer zone sub-counties and by supporting environmentally-sound district planning.

The project had the following key objectives:

First, strengthen the capacity of Masindi District to effectively plan and manage its resources and stimulate sustained environmentally-sound economic growth:

Second, establish the basic conditions for long-term protected area integrity by supporting the development of environmentally-sound and economically viable land-use systems in buffer zones: and

Third, engender a sustained rise in real income of rural men and women, commencing in sub- counties adjacent to the protected area.

The objectives were to be accomplished by providing:

Technical and financial support to the district for environmentally-sound planning.

Assistance with sustainable land-use planning and pilot activity involving the voluntary relocation of up-to 125 households currently residing in and around the protected area: and

Technical and financial assistance needed to catalyze the district economy and stimulate sustained annual increases in the return to agricultural labor.

### Project Management

Agricultural Cooperative Development International (ACDI) in collaboration with the National Environment Information Centre (of NEMA). Short term technical assistance was provided by Volunteers in Overseas Cooperative Assistance.

Funding: USAID

Amount Granted: \$984,831

Implemented by: Agricultural Cooperative Development International

Cooperative Agreement No. 623-0124-A-00-6026-00

### **Purpose of Evaluation**

This evaluation will be conducted to:

Assess progress of the pilot project in terms of implementation of the activities planned in the proposal and determine the degree of success in meeting its established targets. Identify constraints to implementation, and project staff and other stakeholders' response to these constraints.

Assess progress of the project in terms of defining strategy, activity, planning, reporting, personnel management, and financial management. Assess the adaptability and responsiveness of management staff to varying conditions in the field.

Review the project strategy to determine its adequacy and appropriateness to achieve the stated goal: assess the appropriateness of the initial time frame for achieving the preliminary results.

Analyze the effectiveness of the monitoring program at assessing project performance

and progress.

Assess the relevance of the project strategy for future protected areas management programs, including:

- humane methods of handling encroachers
- capacity building for sustainable natural resource management at the local level

Assess the effect of the project on how Masindi District carries out its planning work, i.e., changes that have taken place. What further information or support is needed by the district officials and for what ends?

What are the potential benefits to conservation?

What lessons seem to exist from this project?

Assess the relevance of the existing institutional framework for management of natural resources and relate it to EPED's support to the district planning activities.

Make recommendations for the next phase.

### **Methods and Procedures**

The evaluation team will spend five days in Masindi interacting with the district officials, relocated and host communities, and project staff.

Meet with USAID, UWA, MTWA, and Forestry Department in Kampala to solicit their views and expectations regarding project implementation.

Meet with the local UWA staff working in the project area to discuss their contribution/involvement in the project activities.

The team will also review available project reports and records.

A one-day meeting with NEMA to discuss its participation in the project is also necessary.

### **Evaluation Team Composition**

The evaluation team will be selected by USAID and the Grants Management Unit, preferably including a local consultant with relevant background in protected areas management and local level development planning.

Other members of the team will be seconded from USAID/APE, GMU and

USAID/REDSO.

### **Reporting Requirements**

The format of the evaluation will follow those prescribed in the supplement of chapter 12 of the USAID Handbook 3 and will include an executive summary, a table of contents, the body of the report and appropriate appendices (e.g., the evaluation Scope of Work, list of people met, Bibliography, etc).

The report will be written jointly by the evaluation team under the coordination of the Team Leader who will be responsible for the ultimate content of the report. The Team Leader will be responsible for debriefing USAID, GMU and Masindi District authorities, and for submission of the final evaluation document. The Team Leader will complete the final report within three weeks after the completion of field work, and will submit 3 copies of the final report to USAID/Kampala and a copy each to Masindi District Administration, Grants Management Unit (GMU), and to ACDI/VOCA (through EPED Project).

The team will begin the evaluation on or around 25<sup>th</sup> August, 1997 for a period of six consecutive days.

## **Appendix II : Itinerary**

### **PROJECT EVALUATION PROGRAM AUGUST 24 - 31, 1997**

|                   |   |               |
|-------------------|---|---------------|
| MONDAY 8.25.97    | Meetings in Kampala:  |               |
|                   | Grants Management Unit  | 10.00         |
|                   | NEMA  | 11.00         |
|                   | Arrival, check in at Masindi Hotel                                      | 6.30          |
| TUESDAY 8.26.97   | Briefing by Project Staff   | 8.30 - 10.00  |
|                   | Meet with LCV Chairman  | 10.00 - 10.30 |
|                   | Meet with RDC Masindi   | 10.30 - 11.00 |
|                   | Visit Mpumwe with LC I Chairman   | 11.00 - 1700  |
| WEDNESDAY 8.27.97 | Visit Kitengule village, meet with host and relocated community members | 8.30 - 13.00  |
|                   | Discuss with District Planning Unit                                     | 15.00 - 16.00 |
|                   | Discuss with MSGGA Executive  | 16.00 - 17.00 |
| THURSDAY 8.28.97  | Visit Alimugonza village meet with host and relocated community members | 9.00 - 13.00  |
|                   | Visit Kimina A village, meet with host and relocated community members  | 14.00 - 17.00 |
| FRIDAY 8.29.97    | Visit Hanga village, meet with host and relocated community members     | 8.30 - 12.00  |
|                   | Wrap up discussions   | 14.00 - 16.00 |

### Appendix III --Persons Consulted

|                   |  |
|-------------------|--|
| Raymond Victurine | Coordinator, Grants Management Unit                              |
| Charles Akol      | District Support Coordinator - NEMA                              |
| Frank Turyatunga  | Project Director, EPED   |
| Benson Turamye    | Senior Planner, EPED   |
| Hannan Ndirooraho | Resettlement Submanager, EPED                                    |
| Edward Mugenyi    | Quantity Control Accountant, EPED                                |
| Jos Wamara        | LC5 Chairman, Masindi  |
| Zedekiya Karokora | RDC, Masindi   |
| Moses Atuha       | District Planner/Statistician Masindi District                   |
| Daniel Wanzala    | Chairman, MSSGA  |
| Godfrey Kagoro    | General Secretary, MSGGA & Project Manager ADF                   |
| Frank Kyamanywa   | Vice Chairman, MSGGA   |
| Mansur Tembo      | Business Manager, MSGGA  |
| Johnson Wamara    | Chairman LCI, Kitengule village                                  |
| Sebastian Aguda   | Chairman, Relocation Committee<br>Kitengule and Kimina villages  |
| Amos Kiwanuka     | Progressive farmer/Elder Kitengule village                       |
| Kiiza             | Elder, Kitengule village   |
| C. Mangara        | Elder, Kitengule village   |
| Tito Kito         | Elder, Kitengule village   |
| Joseph Wandera    | Elder Kimina "A" village   |
| John Bagonza      | Secretary, Relocation committee<br>Kitengule and Kimina villages |
| Kyamanywa         | Youth, Kimina "A" village  |
| Stephen Wandukwa  | Elder, Kimina "A" village  |
| Ason Werikhe      | Relocate, Kimina "A" village                                     |
| Patrick Nalyamya  | Relocate, Kimina "A" village                                     |
| Joseph Nalondo    | Chairman, Relocation Committee, Alimugonza village               |
| Joram Sabiiti     | Elder, Alimugonza village  |
| Joseph Mangongo   | Relocate Alimugonza village                                      |
| Salim             | Elder, Alimugonza village  |
| Situma Mayende    | Relocate, Alimugonza village                                     |
| Michael Kasangaki | Chairman LCI, Hanga village                                      |
| William Kyomya    | Vice Chairman LC I, Hanga, village                               |
| Johnson Bagonza   | Member, Hanga village  |
| N. Wander         | Secretary LC I, Hanga village                                    |
| Peter Waiswa      | Elder, Hanga, village  |
| Butoto Jackson    | Elder, Hanga, village  |
| Nafutali Mugerwa  | Elder, Hanga, village  |
| Mrs. Kyomya       | Women Representative, Hanga LC1.                                 |

## Appendix IV Documents Consulted

- A pilot project for Environment Protection and Economic Development, Masindi District, Uganda. a proposal submitted to Grants Management Units, Action Programme for the Environment. ACDI, Washington, November 1995.
- Bakebwa Milton: Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) Report: EPED Project, Masindi, January 1997.
- EPED: Quarterly report No. 1: June-September, 1996: 10<sup>th</sup> September, 1996
- EPED: Quarterly report No. 2: October-December, 1996: 8<sup>th</sup> January, 1997
- EPED: Quarterly report No. 3: January-March, 1997: 10<sup>th</sup> April, 1997
- EPED: Quarterly report No. 4: April-June, 1997: 23<sup>rd</sup> July, 1997
- Gavin Olney: Crop Marketing and Micro-enterprise Development in Masindi District under an extended Environmental Protection and Economic Development project, consultancy report, under contract no. 254, ACDI/VOCA August, 1997.
- Kabann Kabanankye: Community Profile, Masindi, ACDI/EPED, November, 1996
- Masindi District Sustainable Development Plan: Draft of August, 1997; Masindi
- Mujuni Edson: Environmental Impact Assessment Study for Masindi EPED Project, Consultancy Report ACDI/VOCA, July 1997.
- Namukasa Florence and Kityo Robert (Editors), Behangana Mathias, Etyang Patrick, Bakamwesiga Hillary, Owiunji Isiah and Andrew Martin, Biodiversity of Karuma Wildlife Reserve based on studies conducted in two of the encroached areas, the Kibyama and Mpumwe villages, EPED, May/June 1997.
- Richard R. Nathaniel, EPED: Feasibility study for the development of a Mini-Hydro Power plant, Irrigation and Gravity Water supply schemes for the people of the flat lands of the Western Rift Valley along the Eastern shore of Lake Albert, Consultancy Report, Project Code 405, EPED May, 1997.
- Sensenig Barton (1996): EPED Monitoring and Evaluation Framework, Masindi District Environmental Protection and Economic Development (EPED) Project, Consultancy

*EPED Evaluation August 1997*

Report. Contract No. 254. ACDI Washington. October, 1996.

- Sensenig Barton (1996): EPED Monitoring and Evaluation, Masindi EPED Project, (2<sup>nd</sup> M&E Consultancy) Contract No. 254, ACDI Washington. April 3, 1997.
- Working paper for the Resettlement Implementation Plan. (RIP), of the voluntary resettlement component, Masindi District Environment Protection and Economic Development (EPED) pilot project.
- Budget Revision Notes
- Papers in draft proposal for follow-on activities, to the present phase of the EPED project.